

**CMER Meeting  
January 23, 2003  
Sawyer Hall  
Minutes**

---

Attendees:

|                     |                                     |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Clark, Jeffrey      | Weyerhaeuser                        |
| Dieu, Julie         | Rayonier                            |
| Dominquez, Larry    | DNR                                 |
| Ehinger, Bill       | DOE                                 |
| Fransen, Brian      | Weyerhaeuser                        |
| Glass, Domoni       | Glass Environmental                 |
| Goldman, Peter      | WFLC                                |
| Green, Matthew      | DOE                                 |
| Grizzel, Jeff       | DNR                                 |
| Hansen, Craig       | USFWS                               |
| Heide, Pete         | WFPA                                |
| Herman, Jed         | DNR                                 |
| Hunter, Mark        | WDFW                                |
| Jackson, Terry      | WDFW                                |
| Keller, Steve       | NMFS                                |
| MaCracken, Jim      | Longview Fibre                      |
| Martin, Doug        | CMER co-chair, Martin Environmental |
| McConnell, Steve    | NWIFC                               |
| McNaughton, Geoff   | AMPA, DNR                           |
| Mobbs, Mark         | Quinault Indian Nation              |
| Murray, Toby        | Murray Pacific                      |
| Nodger, Alex        | DNR State Lands                     |
| Palmquist, Bob      | NWIFC                               |
| Parks, David        | DNR                                 |
| Pavel, Joseph       | NWIFC                               |
| Peterson, Pete      | UCUT                                |
| Price, Dave         | WDFW                                |
| Pucci, Dawn         | Suquamish Tribe                     |
| Quinn, Tim          | CMER Co-chair, WDFW                 |
| Raines, Mary        | NWIFC                               |
| Rowe, Blake         | Longview Fibre                      |
| Rowton, Heather     | WFPA                                |
| Schuett-Hames, Dave | NWIFC                               |
| Smitch, Curt        | Thompson Consulting Group           |
| Stringer, Angela    | Campbell Group                      |
| Sturhan, Nancy      | DNR                                 |
| Sweitzer, Dave      | Hardwoods Commission                |

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Vaugeois, Laura | DNR |
|-----------------|-----|

Summary of Decisions and Tasks:

| Decision/Task  | Section of Minutes             |
|--|--------------------------------|
| <b>Assignments:</b> McNaughton will take a lead in getting the SAGE literature review under contract. McNaughton and the CMER co-chairs will get a full accounting of what funding is encumbered.  | Budget Update                  |
| <b>CMER Consensus:</b> An additional \$56,860 was approved for the Landform Hazard Classification System & Mapping Protocols project. This recommendation will be forwarded to Policy and the FPB for final approval.  | Budget Update                  |
| <b>CMER Consensus:</b> RSAG was directed to move forward with the Type N/F effectiveness study by beginning on the Type N portion of the study and specifically moving forward with two strata (Westside western Hemlock zone/Type N and eastside Douglas-fir-Grand Fir/Type N. RSAG will present findings one year from now and further discussion and approvals will occur at that time. | Review of SAG requests         |
| <b>Assignment:</b> Pleus, McNaughton, Quinn and Price will work on resolving the issues with the University.   | SRC Update                     |
| <b>Assignment:</b> CMER agreed to provide comments on the proposed ground rules by February 6 <sup>th</sup> . A revised set of ground rules will then be proposed to CMER for final approval.  | CMER Handbook Committee Update |
| <b>CMER Consensus:</b> SAGs should bring issues to CMER and CMER will then decide whether the issue should move forward to policy. The co-chairs will take responsibility for delivering the messages to policy. Issues may also be initiated at the CMER level and forwarded to policy through the co-chairs.   | SAG Issues                     |
| <b>Assignment:</b> The fish passage issues have been framed for policy and ISAG will bring the write-up to CMER for review at the February meeting.  | SAG Issues                     |
| <b>Assignment:</b> Comments from CMER will be requested on the draft PIP report and will be due by February 12 <sup>th</sup> .   | SAG Issues                     |
| <b>CMER Consensus:</b> CMER accepts the Landslide Hazard Zonation management proposal as presented as having scientific merit and is moving it forward to policy. Pucci abstained from the voting.   | SAG Issues                     |

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Science Topic for February</b>  | Amphibians Program     |
| <b>CMER Consensus:</b> CMER will indicate to Policy that the rule tool ranking could not be accomplished and will provide the complete list as shown, except the unstable land form projects will be broken out. All scoring will be removed. DNR will conduct their prioritization separately.  | Prioritization Session |
| <b>Assignment to SAGs:</b> provide budget estimates for each program you are responsible for. The estimates should be broken out as follows: 2003, 2004, 2005, outyears. The information must be sent to Dave Schuett-Hames by Monday, 1/27.   | Prioritization Section |
| <p>Quinn and Martin will prepare a submission package for policy that will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project rankings</li> <li>• The risk and uncertainty chart</li> <li>• The rankings of the projects</li> <li>• The rule tool results</li> <li>• projected budget numbers</li> <li>• background for project approval requests for type N/F effectiveness and LHZ mapping</li> </ul> | Prioritization Section |
| <b>Assignment to SAGs:</b> Forward policy issues to Rowton for inclusion on an upcoming meeting agenda. Background should accompany your request. The list of issues will be reviewed by CMER before being placed on the policy agenda.  | Prioritization Section |

Additional Agenda Items to be considered at end of meeting:

- UPSAG Landslide Hazard Zonation Proposal
- SAGE will have an item for discussion
- Sturhan: CMER manpower update

---

December minutes have not been distributed as revised and will be approved at the February meeting.

---

**Watertyping/Model Issues:** Herman updated CMER will be framing the key implementation issues for policy consideration so that the model can be implemented on time. Herman will work with CMER and policy to frame these issues for decision-making and DNR will take the lead. There is a joint CMER policy meeting on 1/29 and the issues should be framed by then but no key decisions will be made on the 29<sup>th</sup>. Price

said that ISAG has been working with the stakeholder group to frame these issues. Herman said that there will be no changes in who is working on this but the way things are getting framed will change. Smitch added that there is increasing interest at the policy level regarding how the Watertyping effort is going. Policy wants to know where we are with this and when questions will be framed for decision-making.

---

**CMER Budget Update:** McNaughton said that despite state and federal budget problems, the CMER budget is still in tact. McNaughton attempted to get more money for compliance and effectiveness monitoring but this did not get into the Governor's budget proposal. There are many opportunities to cooperate with other monitoring efforts and McNaughton will take a lead in exploring these opportunities. The budget sheet has not changed.

There is still \$378,000 available in state funds that must be spent by June 30<sup>th</sup>. It can be carried over to pay invoices for projects that are federally funded, but that is not the preferred route. At this time, there is \$2.2 million under contract. \$1.4 million is outstanding. Each year, CMER gets \$600,000 for adaptive management from the state. This year, we anticipate spending about \$200,000 for RMZ resampling and additional monies for staff and overhead. This will leave the \$378,000. Glass said that SAGE had planned on a literature review, but it is now being reprioritized and Ron Johnson indicated that DNR could not let the contract until prioritization is complete. Glass indicated that it is still possible to get this contract done but it must be done quickly. McNaughton said that this is an internal DNR communication problem and he will work it out. Smitch cautioned the group that if we have state monies left over that are appropriated to federal projects, the federal government may reduce funding in the future. The state will also look to these extra monies and will re-allocate them if they are unspent. Price said that ISAG will also be requesting dollars next month. McNaughton and CMER co-chairs will get a full accounting of what we are looking at and what's encumbered and what's not.

**Assignments:** McNaughton will take a lead in getting the SAGE literature review under contract. McNaughton and the CMER co-chairs will get a full accounting of what funding is encumbered.

UPSAG has a board approved project and have just negotiated a final contract price for it. The original budget estimate was \$20,000 to revise landform hazard mapping protocols for mass wasting and for the LHZ project. There was a good response on the proposal and after evaluation by UPSAG, the contract is \$76,860. UPSAG is requesting that the additional \$56,860 be approved and allocated for this project. McNaughton said that an increase this large will need to be approved by the FPB. Raines said that originally, when they thought about this project, they did not have pilot testing but they now do. McNaughton said that there was precedence for signing a contract for an amount larger than the Board-approved amount, as long as there was very strong contract language stating that the amount was contingent on available funding. That way the contract could

at least get underway prior to getting the larger amount approved by the Board. The review part of this project can be separated from the field work.

Smitch asked how this fits into a prioritization process. If a project goes in and the cost triples, how does that fit in? Raines suggested that their budget will firm up as the prioritization is completed. This project will not be seen at the policy level. Dieu added that if anything of the mass wasting or LHZ projects receive a high prioritization score, this project will be necessary to complete the project. Martin does not think it should be delayed, especially given its essential nature. The proposal is to increase this project from \$20,000 to \$76,860. Pleus said that CMER needs to decide whether this is worth the increase.

**CMER Consensus:** An additional \$56,860 was approved for the Landform Hazard Classification System & Mapping Protocols project. This recommendation will be forwarded to Policy and the FPB for final approval.

---

### **Review of SAG Requests:**

N/F Effectiveness Proposal: Rowe said that, RSAG e-mailed the final study design for this project earlier this month with a recommendation for approval. This design has been through the SRC process and the CMER staff worked to incorporate the recommendations from that review. RSAG is unanimously recommending that this project move forward. The CMER staff will administer this project but will let several contracts. No additional CMER staff will be necessary for this project; some of McFadden's time will be used to identify study sites. RSAG is not recommending any additional peer review for the final study design.

Martin asked if there are any questions.

- Heide said that he reviewed the design and sent some comments to Martin and Rowe. His edits relate more to process, not science and he hopes they will be considered as potential improvements. There was also some discussion of how the rules protect around the equipment limitation zone and he has suggested corrections of interpretation here. Rowe said that he expects to get more editorial comments and there will be another version of this but the study design is complete.
- Price also submitted comments regarding technical streamlining that can be done to reduce costs. Getting an assessment of the baseline and then reviewing study plots after these events would be beneficial. He was surprised by the dollar amount; it seems high but the write-up is very good. Schuett-Hames said that there are many sites and the peer review process resulted in additional sites for control. Accommodating this request requires that the number of sites be doubled. Hunter commented that the original design was far larger than this so the study has really been streamlined.
- Martin asked how many people read this study design. The proposal ranges from \$1.5 to \$3 million over 6 years. This is a good study design but is technically challenging, in terms of securing sample population and data gathering tools. Quinn asked if that

argues for a pilot approach to the study and some CMER meetings to discuss this. Schuett-Hames said that they did put a couple of options in the study and RSAG did not approve an implementation option. The study is designed to be implemented in a modular fashion and it was designed this way to give CMER the flexibility to decide at what rate they wanted to implement the study. The choices range from starting with one stratum to starting with all strata. Staff would like to start the first year with a limited scope to get experience testing the procedures. Schuett-Hames would council that starting with a limited scope would be good.

- Raines said the staff has been working on this design for about 3 years and it has received much review. She is unclear what decision we are making here today and recommends a ½ day session to review the options and get the background information. Rowe said that a detailed presentation of the study design has also been presented to CMER.
- Quinn asked what this means time wise. Rowe said that if CMER approves the design today, RSAG can utilize the field season. Quinn asked, if the decision was deferred today and made following a science session, would that preclude the ability to start the project this summer.
- Pleus proposed that CMER approves Shuett-Hames recommendation to get started at a basic level at this time. Dieu said that the pilot study would likely not be statistically valid. The proposal on the table now is to pick a stratum and go with it. Mobbs is seeing a strong implication from this group that expensive and complex studies are not funded. Dominiquez said that by its very nature, the early years are pilot like. Pleus would like to see something get going today. This is a big project and a workshop will be valuable.
- Smitch said that this issue brings to the table how CMER does business. We need to learn from this and capture this for the next round. This SAG is coming here with a peer-reviewed proposal and this group has not read it. If you have not read it or spent the time on it, at this time, you have ability to hold it up. We should decide whether we have confidence in our SAGs. The other issue is that people are budget sensitive. This is clearly a high priority for everyone, so the question is how do we get out of this loop and maintain our scientific credibility and collegiality.
- MacCracken agrees with Hunter, this has been through the ringer many times and it's ready to move forward.
- Glass agreed with MacCracken. SAGE is now scoping eastside issues and would like to work with RSAG as SAGE completes their scoping. It could benefit both SAGs in that case.
- Ehinger said that the strata being proposed are the ones that represent the greatest acreage of lands under FFR.
- Heide said he would like to address Smitch's point. Martin and Heide have talked about how CMER works and some of these projects are very complex so we need a reporting in process where the people doing the work update CMER about what they have accomplished during the year. This will give CMER continual input on the process and allow for revisions throughout implementation. Formalizing this review process will be important.
- Rowe said that, in thinking about the sequence of steps: the firsts step will be for CMER staff to create a database to track FPAs and locate study sites and this will take

a while. Step two will be that study sites will be found and located in the field and a contract will be written to do the work. If CMER you approves this now, there will be plenty of opportunity to have a workshop and keep working on this.

- Martin said that there are some serious feasibility questions that need to be answered here and until that is done, he is reluctant to approve the project. The population you select for a paired approach will limit your ability to address questions requiring a multivariate approach (e.g., causal relationships or correlations) . When you have a study that proposes to answer both, you need to look carefully at it. There are also serious questions about the metrics being used and whether they will work. He suggests testing the method and sample population in a pilot study and then moving forward from there. At that time, we will have a very clear picture of what can be accomplished and what it will cost.

**CMER Consensus:** RSAG was directed to move forward with the Type N/F effectiveness study by beginning on the Type N portion of the study and specifically moving forward with two strata (Westside western Hemlock zone/Type N and eastside Douglas-fir-Grand Fir/Type N. RSAG will present findings one year from now and further discussion and approvals will occur at that time.

---

**SRC Update:** the contract (actually an Interagency Agreement) is still delayed mostly because the UW is insisting on rights to data and copyright language that is not consistent with DNR/AG-approved contract language. The AG's office responded that they will not review the proposed UW contract language, and view this as an interagency dispute having low priority for AG review.

The second reason for delay is that we are entertaining a UW proposal for a more comprehensive and integrated role in the adaptive management program. For example, publishing CMER reports on-line, and ensuring CMER databases can be integrated with others at the national level. McElroy and McNaughton met with the UW this week to discuss this but no specific proposal is ready yet. Rather than wait on this more comprehensive proposal, McNaughton suggests proceeding with the SRC portion at this time with specific contract language laying out what is shared with UW and what is not. DNR did join the Washington Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit so overhead is waived on UW contracts. McNaughton will explore additional benefits that CMER may have as a result of joining the research unit.

MacCracken said that we might want to start thinking about alternatives to the University doing this project. Mobbs asked, if you have a project that is reviewed upon completion, are they saying that they own that data? McNaughton said no. Hunter pointed out that many people working in CMER want to publish their data; they don't want the University to publish it. Pleus said that we looked at several possibilities when we selected the UW and maybe we should look elsewhere.

---

Pleus proposes that Policy reinvigorate the work group to look at this question in a broader scope. Smitch said that if you are asking academics to help you at a low cost, then they will want to publish. Martin asked if there is some reason that we cannot just get this contract. Price volunteers to work with McNaughton on language and other things as did Quinn and Pleus.

Grizzel said, to provide background, when we established the original contract with UW to establish the RFP, we received two responses and one of the respondents clearly was not qualified to do this. Therefore, there was really only one response.

**Assignment:** Pleus, McNaughton, Quinn and Price will work on resolving the issues with the University.

---

**CMER Handbook Progress:** The CMER handbook committee has been meeting and is now proposing a set of ground rules for CMER review. The primary question is whether these ground rules will be helpful. Raines asked the group to make a distinction between ground rules that are how we agree to behave versus those that are how we make decisions. Ground rules should be behavior based and very simple. There is a lot of other stuff within the outline for the manual that suggests how we make decisions.

**Assignment:** CMER agreed to provide comments by February 6<sup>th</sup>. A revised set of ground rules will then be proposed to CMER for final approval.

---

### **SAG Issues:**

When to do DFC presentation: There will be a DFC presentation soon to see review results of the pilot study. Martin said that CMER needs to review the science in the report. Based on these results, we need to report what this means in terms of informing the rule. Schuett-Hames said that they are finishing the statistical analysis and are getting near completion and they are now outlining what will be in the final report. RSAG will likely be recommending that the report go to the SRC for peer review. CMER should look at this report before it goes to SRC. The workshop will help CMER couch the issues in a way that will inform policy. Sturhan said that she would like to see the presentation in March if at all possible. A workshop will be scheduled for March 19<sup>th</sup> and the report will go out at a later date.

Bull Trout site selection and permit status: Jackson said that there is a meeting next week and Cupp will bring forward data supporting sites for the project. They will report back at the next CMER meeting about next steps.

Last Fish Report: Fransen said that the Westside is moving along and modeling should be completed by the end of March. The Watertyping coordinator position is not filled yet but will be soon. ISAG will solicit existing survey data from eastside cooperators. Glass asked if there is anything that eastside landowners can do to help this move faster. Fransen said that collecting and presenting the data to DNR would be helpful. They



Smitch asked what happens if there is a project that can't get implemented because of agency manpower. CMER is responsible for making policy aware of this issue. Pleus said a formal process to bring these issues to policy is needed.

**CMER Consensus:** SAGs can bring issues to CMER and CMER will then vote to take (or not take) the issue forward to policy. The co-chairs will take responsibility for delivering the messages. Issues may also be initiated at the CMER level and forwarded to policy through the co-chairs.

Fish passage direction discussion with stakeholders: There is nothing in the workplan about fish passage because there is disagreement about what needs to be done.

**Assignment:** The issues have been framed for policy and ISAG will bring it to CMER for review at the February meeting.

PIP results discussion with stakeholders: there was a PIP workshop a couple of weeks ago and policy papers were developed and are being reviewed by co-chairs. The draft report for the pilot study will be out for formal review by Wednesday of next week.

**Assignment:** Comments from CMER will be requested and will be due by February 12<sup>th</sup>. Comments will be requested within two weeks.

Palmquist has had a request for the data. Martin said that we have agreed that any requests for information or data must come through the public disclosure process. CMER concluded, that we could not actually control when that information is given out. CMER can caveat the data with information, but it is public when it reaches DNR. Some of the data collected from this study is private and was not paid for by CMER so people must contact the cooperators for that data.

Landslide Hazard Zonation Management Proposal: UPSAG is requesting CMER approval of the revised LHZ management proposal for continuation of this project at this time. UPSAG has addressed concerns about the proposal raised by Timothy Quinn at the October 17 CMER meeting by providing a clear explanation of how products will be reviewed and released. Quinn had also asked why options were not considered. Dieu and Raines responded that the FFR negotiators envisioned a specific project and methodology to map the unstable landforms of the state. UPSAG responded to that request by laying out a management proposal for implementing the accepted methodology for mapping landslide hazard areas at a landscape scale in such a way that it is much more consistent and reliable. UPSAG members have also been recently counseled by DNR FPD staff and the AMPA to re-evaluate the project, specifically if the nature of the study allows it to be broken into components that could be selectively funded, because of the state budget crisis and the \$2.1 million in federal funding dedicated to this project. UPSAG's response to these overtures is that they have worked for 11 months on this proposal based on formal guidance and they will only redraft this if there is direction from policy to do

so. Therefore, UPSAG is seeking CMER approval of the proposal as it stands on the scientific merit.

Dieu said that the request to UPSAG was not appropriate. Grizzel said that there may have been some misinterpretation; no one within DNR policy has said that they need the money for compliance monitoring.

Smitch said that this is raising a fundamental question about how CMER does business.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER accepts this proposal as presented as having scientific merit and is moving it forward to policy. Pucci abstained from the voting.

LWAG Issues: LWAG would like to repeat the salamander resampling and will bring a proposal to CMER soon. The amphibian program is ready for a science presentation. They would like to do this in February.

---

**Next agenda science topic:** The amphibian program will be the science topic for February. **Note: LWAG is not ready to give this presentation yet so a new science topic will be chosen for the February meeting.**

---

**Effectiveness Program Ranking Results:** Schuett-Hames said that the rule tool rankings had been sent out with a couple of questions. Nine people responded and a handout displaying the results is available. Two questions were asked: 1) how important is the method and 2) what degree of improvement does the tool provide. Raines said that she was not sure how useful this information will be because the questions were taken out of context. Unless we are going to go through these as a group, she does not see the value in this. Quinn said that CMER concluded that DNR needs to take a more active approach to the rule tool ranking and development. Mobbs said that he was not sure that this was the final result of this meeting. Pucci asked whether it was taken into consideration whether or not a tool was needed for a study. Schuett-Hames said that the primary purpose of all of these projects is to implement rules. Pleus asked if we are looking to eliminate any of these rule tools?. Martin said no, we are simply providing recommendations to policy about what is most important. Pleus said that only nine responses may be a sign of apathy or a sign of misunderstanding. Raines suggested that the mass wasting projects should be divided out.

Raines suggested that CMER discuss each rule tool, provide information about what the tool is designed to accomplish and what it will be used for, then come to a group agreement on ranking. Quinn suggested that we not rank the DFC programs or the type N delineation because they are at policy decision points. Martin suggested that we table this discussion of re-ranking because we do not have enough time to redo the process. Instead Martin suggested we simply submit the report to policy and DNR. Grizzel said

that it is important that CMER provides its perspective to policy. A vote was taken on the proposals and was then discarded because it was not a consensus decision.

Grizzel explained that DNR staff (McNaughton, Herman, Schroff, Cramer) will meet on Monday, review the information that has been provided and reach consensus on what the priorities should be.

Raines and Dieu insisted that the unstable land form projects be broken out.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER will indicate to Policy that the ranking could not be accomplished and will provide the complete list as shown, except the unstable land form projects will be broken out. All scoring will be removed. DNR will conduct their prioritization separately.

---

**Program budget projections:** CMER needs to begin projecting numbers into the future for projects. Hansen said that this will be important as we develop the HCP and assurances package. Price said that ISAG does have one big increase and it's in the fish model. Everyone else has remained fairly steady. Quinn, Martin and Schuett-Hames will pull the projections together and will provide the information to policy. The SAGS were requested to submit budget numbers for 2003, 2004, 2005 and another number for outyears. Caveats will be provided for this to policy. We all know that some of these projects are not well scoped yet and firm numbers cannot be provided.

**Assignment to SAGs:** provide estimates for each program you are responsible for. The estimates should be broken out as follows: 2003, 2004, 2005, outyears. The information must be sent to Dave Schuett-Hames by Monday, 1/27.

Quinn and Martin will prepare a submission package for policy that will include:

- Project rankings
- The risk and uncertainty chart
- The rankings of the projects
- The rule tool results
- projected budget numbers
- background for project approval requests for type N/F effectiveness and LHZ mapping

McConnell said that there are a lot of funded projects that are not being implemented at the current time and there are numerous other issues that policy needs to provide guidance on. These issues should be forwarded to Rowton so they can be discussed and scheduled for discussion on 1/29.

**Assignment to SAGs:** Forward policy issues to Rowton for inclusion on an upcoming meeting agenda. Background should accompany your request. The list of issues will be reviewed by CMER before being placed on the policy agenda.

Next CMER Meeting; February 20<sup>th</sup>.